

Appl. No. : 09/277,482
Filed : March 26, 1999

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to reconsider the above-captioned application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following comments.

Discussion of Objections to the Claims

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to dependent Claim 4 in light of the fact that it was dependent on a cancelled claim. Applicant respectfully submits that this has been corrected by the above-amendments.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-6, 9, 10, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. In particular, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 4, 5, 9, and 16, for failing to provide adequate antecedent basis for the limitation "said logic circuit." Claims 2, 6, 10, and 17 were rejected because of their dependency. Applicant respectfully submits that this has been corrected by the above-amendments.

Discussion of Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1, 2, and 4-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,199,163, to Dumas, et al (hereinafter "Dumas") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,864,616, to Pond (hereinafter "Pond"). To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. See M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. Applicant respectfully submits that Dumas and Pond fail to teach or suggest at least one claim limitation from each of the above-listed claims.

In one embodiment of the invention, a logic circuit is configured to receive digital data from a host processor. The logic circuit forwards the digital data to a digital data storage device

in an encrypted form. In one embodiment, the logic circuit is configured to encrypt said digital data and forward the digital data to the digital storage device without intervention of the host processor. For example, Figure 3 illustrated in one embodiment that a logic circuit (50) is between a processor (36) and drives (38) and (40). The logic circuit (50) receives data provided by the processor (36) and encrypts the data prior to transmission to the hard drives (38) and (40). In one embodiment, the logic circuit (50) is part of a bus-to-bus bridge. *See* page 9, lines 9 – 23. The bus-to-bus bridge includes a configuration register that is used to store information that is used by the bus-to-bus bridge to determine when to enable and disable encryption. The configuration register may store bits that are used to determine which storage devices are to receive encrypted data.

Turning to the claims it is seen that Claim 1 recites “wherein said bus-to-bus bridge is configured to encrypt said digital data and forward the digital data to the digital storage device without intervention of the host processor, and wherein a configuration register in the bus-to-bus bridge is adapted to store information that is used by the bus-to-bus bridge to selectively enable and disable encryption depending on the target device that is to receive the data that is transmitted via the bus-to-bus bridge.” Independent Claims 7, 11, 13, and 17 each recite similar limitations.

Applicant respectfully submits that there is no teaching or suggestion in Dumas that the security system is included in a bus-to-bus bridge. In Dumas, the security system is installed in an application specific integrated circuit ASIC. *See* col. 2, lines 31-42. Applicant respectfully submits that in Dumas, the security system included is not in a bus-to-bus bridge, as is claimed. Furthermore, Applicant respectfully fails to teach or suggest “wherein a configuration register in the bus-to-bus bridge is adapted to store information that is used by the bus-to-bus bridge to selectively enable and disable encryption depending on the target device that is to receive the data that is transmitted via the bus-to-bus bridge.” Dumas describes the use of a drive security program that can be used to by a user to encrypt and decrypt a drive. Dumas fails to teach or suggest the use of a configuration register in a bus-to-bus bridge. Furthermore, Dumas fails to teach or suggest having the configuration register in the bus-to-bus bridge used to selectively enable and disable encryption depending on the target device that is to receive the data that is transmitted via the bus-to-bus bridge.

Appl. No. : 09/277,482
Filed : March 26, 1999

Moreover, Applicant respectfully submits that Pond fails to teach or suggest "wherein a configuration register in the bus-to-bus bridge is adapted to store information that is used by the logic circuit to selectively enable and disable encryption depending on the target device that is to receive the data that is transmitted via the bus-to-bus bridge." Applicant respectfully submits that this limitation is also wholly missing from Pond.

Since the cited references fails to teach or suggest at least the above-limitations in isolation or in combination, Applicant respectfully submits that this application is in condition for allowance.


Summary

Applicant has endeavored to address all of the Examiner's concerns as expressed in the outstanding Office Action. Accordingly, amendments to the claims for patentability purposes, the reasons therefore, and arguments in support of the patentability of the pending claim set are presented above. Any claim amendments which are not specifically discussed in the above remarks are not made for patentability purposes, and the claims would satisfy the statutory requirements for patentability without the entry of such amendments. In addition, such amendments do not narrow the scope of the claims. Rather, these amendments have only been made to increase claim readability, to improve grammar, and to reduce the time and effort required of those in the art to clearly understand the scope of the claim language. In light of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of the outstanding rejections is specifically requested. If the Examiner has any questions which may be answered by telephone, he is invited to call the undersigned directly.

Respectfully submitted,

KNOBBE, MARTENS, OLSON & BEAR, LLP

Dated: 4/29/2004

By: 
Eric M. Nelson
Registration No. 43,829
Attorney of Record
Customer No. 20,995
(619) 235-8550